

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the previous amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-10 are pending. By this Amendment, Claim 1 is amended.

The Office Action objects to claim 1. Claim 1 is amended to provide antecedent basis for the fuse. Withdraw of the objection to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5 and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 3,984,801 to Mrenna et al.; and rejects claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mrenna in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,776,817 to Jegu et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is directed to a fuse holder comprising, in combination with other claimed features, a spring means and a limiter means. The spring means is adapted to press the contact members against the fuse end and the limiter means is adapted to define the largest possible depth of the fuse end in the installation direction between the first and second contact members. The spring means comprises a ring spring having substantially a form of a circular arch and serves as the limiter means. These features encompasses Applicants' exemplary embodiment as illustrated in Figs. 1 and 2 wherein ring spring 4 presses contact members 8 and 10 against the fuse end 18. Ring spring 4 is substantially in the form of a circular arch and includes limiter means 6 to define the largest possible depth of the fuse end 18 in the installation direction.

The Mrenna patent discloses a fuse clip 10 including a main body member 12. A spring 42 provides tensioning of the clamping arms 24, 26 during insertion and

removal of the fuse 16. The clamping arms 24, 26 have opposing contact surfaces 28, 30 respectively for engaging opposite sides of the fuse end terminal 20. At one end 34 of the main body member 12 are ribs 36, 38 which provide a stop for the insertion of the fuse 16. Also, when installing a class R fuse, an annular groove 18 is aligned with inward extensions 54, 56 of a rejection member 14. The spring 42 does not serve as a limiter means to define the largest possible depth of the fuse end as in Applicants' independent claim 1.

As shown in the attached enlarged copy of Fig. 5 of the Mrenna patent, a circular dash line has been added to depict an end terminal of a fuse inserted into the fuse holder. It is clear that there would be a gap between the end terminal and the ring spring 42. Thus, it shown that the ring spring 42 does not prevent the end terminal of the fuse from being push into the fuse clip 10. Further, as stated in the Mrenna patent at column 2 beginning at line 55, if desired, a steel spring can be inserted into the notches 40 on the outside of the clapping arms 24, 26. The ring spring 42 may be optional and appears to provide the function of tensioning the clamping arms, 24,26 during insertion and removal of the fuse 16. Thus, the Mrenna patent does not disclose spring means serving as the limiter means, as in Applicants' independent claim 1.

The Jego patent does not overcome the deficiencies of the Mrenna patent discussed above.

The remaining dependent claims are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above as well as for the individual feature they recite.

Early and favorable action with respect to this application is respectfully requested.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application, or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: February 22, 2008

By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'P. Keane', written over a horizontal line.

Patrick C. Keane
Registration No. 32858

Michael Britton
Registration No. 47620

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620